

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-6 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Sakaguchi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,476,789). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claims 1, 2, and 5 recite, in part and with reference to Figure 2 for exemplary purposes only, “a base material [21] having an edge portion [212] bonded to a vicinity of said one side of said panel substrate [12]” and “wherein said driver controlling electronic components [22] and said second driver IC [26] are mounted on the same base material [21]” (emphasis added).

In contrast to amended Claims 1, 2, and 5, the Sakaguchi et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 2, a flexible substrate 5 spaced apart from an LCD panel 4. The Sakaguchi et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest bonding the flexible substrate 5 directly to the LCD panel 4 as set forth in amended Claims 1, 2, and 5. The Sakaguchi et al. reference further discloses driver chips 1 and 2 mounted to tape carrier packages 3 and a controller circuit 6 mounted to the flexible substrate 5. The Sakaguchi et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest mounting either of the driver chips 1 and 2 to the flexible substrate 5 so that “said driver controlling electronic components and said second driver IC are mounted on the same base material,” as set forth in amended Claims 1, 2, and 5.

Because the Sakaguchi et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of amended Claims 1, 2, and 5, the Sakaguchi et al. reference fails to anticipate or render obvious Claims 1, 2, and 5, and those claims dependent therefrom. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim 3 recites, in part and with reference to Figure 2 for exemplary purposes only, “a base material [21] having an edge portion [212] bonded to a vicinity of said one side of said panel substrate [12].” Claim 3 further recites, “a second driver IC [26] mounted on one surface of said base material [21]” and “driver-controlling electronic components [22] mounted on said one surface of said base material [21].”

In contrast to amended Claims 1, 2, and 5, the Sakaguchi et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 2, a flexible substrate 5 spaced apart from an LCD panel 4. The Sakaguchi et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest bonding the flexible substrate 5 directly to the LCD panel 4 as set forth in amended Claims 1, 2, and 5. The Sakaguchi et al. reference further discloses driver chips 1 and 2 mounted to tape carrier packages 3 and a controller circuit 6 mounted to the flexible substrate 5. The Sakaguchi et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest mounting either of the driver chips 1 and 2 to the flexible substrate 5 along with the controller circuit 6, as set forth in Claim 3.

The Sakaguchi et al. reference fails to disclose each and every feature of Claim 3. Therefore, the Sakaguchi et al. reference fails to anticipate or render obvious Claim 3 and those claims dependent therefrom. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 3 and those claims dependent therefrom.

**ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER**

The Examiner states that Claims 7-9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for recognizing the patentable features of these claims and wish to point out that Claims 7-9 are patentable for numerous reasons in addition to those cited by the Examiner. However, because Claim 3, from which Claims 7-9 depend from, is now in a condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above, Claims 7-9 are also in a condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 25, 2004

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGG/BEW/BGS/les